

ENCL TO
IOEA-1568
COPY 1 OF 1

18 October 1963

To: Art Lundahl
STATINTL

Fr: [REDACTED]

STATINTL

We are enclosing for your information a copy of [REDACTED]
Trip Report to NPIC during the week of October 6th.

STATINTL

[REDACTED]

HRE:jdj

EncSTATINTL

cc: [REDACTED]


17 October 1963

TRIP REPORT

STATINTL

To:

Fr:



A trip was made the week of October 6th to October 11th to Project Headquarters to review quality of the "B" camera film. The following conclusions and recommendations are submitted.

Conclusions:

1. Quality - Resolution on all units was good to very good. Only on one unit, Camera #7, was there any evidence of degradation other than motion or vibration. On Camera #7 there is an area from 2 to 3 inches in from the data chamber to the data chamber all along the bottom of the format which is 10 to 15 lines less than the rest of the format. Our collimation data on Camera #7 has been checked and shows no indication of the above condition. In fact, if anything, the bottom of the format should be slightly better according to the collimation data.
2. Metering - This tends to be a little erratic at times in that the space between frames will vary on most all missions. However, very few overlaps have occurred and over all seems acceptable.
3. Pressure Marks - Marks from the pressure rollers in the camera are appearing consistently on Cameras 3 and 10 and occasionally on the other cameras.
4. Processing - The quality of the field processing has improved, however, it still leaves much to be desired. Much of the film processed in the field has abrasions, scratches, digs, tears, pinholes, foreign matter, water marks and banding due to stoppage during processing and general processing streaks. Of the material processed in the field the Navy PIC does by far the best job.
5. Misc. - On most of the missions viewed on Cameras 7, 8 and 11 the position indicator lights were either very faint or were not detectable at all. In the last mission viewed on Camera #8 (3745) all of the lights were good except 2L. On Camera #7 they were detectable but thin. On Camera #11 a few were barely detectable and the rest were not there at all.

The fiducial frame on Camera #8 appears to be moved away from the platen in that there is a shadow of greater density into the format area about 1/16" around the entire format frame.

-2-

Recommendations:

STATINTL

1. Arrangements were made through [REDACTED] to supply us with evaluation reports on all FOG missions since we were getting no feed back at all other than the mission numbers and the number of cycles. We start receiving the reports on 15 October.

2. The evaluation division at Headquarters has five new evaluators who have not seen the "B" camera. It is suggested that arrangements be made for these P.I. personnel to visit Hycon, and if possible, Detachment G to become familiar with the camera operation and the installation in the aircraft. This would require at least two or three days to accomplish and would give them a much better background for detecting possible camera malfunctions.

STATINTL

[REDACTED]

REF:jdj